



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/100,684	06/19/1998	DANIEL E. TEDESCO	WD2-98-019	8826

22927 7590 07/18/2002

WALKER DIGITAL
FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK
STAMFORD, CT 06905

EXAMINER

MYHRE, JAMES W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/100,684

Applicant(s)
Tedesco et al

Examiner
James W. Myhre

Art Unit
3622



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) _____

(2) Dean Alderucci

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 17, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] ☒ MAIL COPY

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 28-30

Identification of prior art discussed:
None

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant Representative questioned the finality of the last office action in view of the addition of two claims (29 and 30) by the preliminary amendment filed with the RCE. The Examiner explained that Claim 29 was viewed as a subset of the features in Claim 1 and Claim 30 was viewed as a subset of the features in Claim 28. As stated in the Conclusion paragraph of the office action, these "claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art in the next office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114." Therefore, the finality of the office was proper. The Applicant Representative requested the Examiner explicitly state that Claims 29 and 30 were viewed as equivalents of the previously rejected claims to clarify the issue in the event the application is appealed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required